

REMARKS

This communication is in response to the non-final Office Action issued September 14, 2006. The Examiner objected to the written description and the drawings. The Examiner rejected claims 1, 9, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,935,615 to Gellert *et al.* (“Gellert”). The Examiner rejected claims 10-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in view of Gellert modified by one or more of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,544,459 to Maruyama *et al.* (“Maruyama”) and 5,891,381 to Bemis *et al.* (“Bemis”), and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0030179 to Kajikawa *et al.* (“Kajikawa”). The Examiner indicated that claims 2-8 and 17-19 were allowable.

Written Description

In section 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the written description. Specifically, the Examiner objected to the title. The title has been amended above, pursuant to the Examiner’s suggestion.

In view of the foregoing, the Examiner’s objection to the written description is believed to be overcome.

Drawings

In section 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings as not showing non-coplanar inner and outer nozzle orifices as recited in claim 15.

The Applicants have added new Figure 10 to illustrate non-coplanar inner and outer nozzle orifices. This new figure is based on the nozzle illustrated in Figure 4, but with non-coplanar nozzle orifices. No new matter is added. Corresponding amendments have been made to the written description.

In view of the foregoing, the Examiner's objection to the drawings is believed to be overcome.

Allowable Subject Matter

In section 12 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 2-8 and 17-19 were allowable. The Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102, 103

In sections 6-11 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 9-16 under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 or 103 in view of one or more of Gellert, Maruyama, Bemis, and Kajikawa.

Claim 1 has been amended above to include the recitations of claim 2, which the Examiner has indicated is allowed. Claim 2 has been canceled, and claims 3 and 4 have been amended to depend from claim 1. Claim 17, which the Examiner has also indicated is allowed, has been amended to be in independent form.

In view of the foregoing, the Examiner's rejections of the claims are believed to be overcome.

Additional Fees

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficiency, including a \$450 two-month extension fee, or credit any overpayment associated with this application to Bingham McCutchen LLP Deposit Account No. 19-5127 (order no. 4200020365).

Conclusion

The written description and claims 1, 3, 4, and 17 have been amended, and claims 2 and 20-26 have been canceled. Claims 1 and 3-19 are pending in the application, and are believed to be in condition for allowance. In view of the foregoing, all of the Examiner's rejections of the

claims are believed to be overcome. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and issuance of a Notice of Allowance for all claims. Should the Examiner feel further communication would help prosecution, the Examiner is urged to call the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully Submitted,



Sean P. O'Hanlon
Reg. No. 47,252

Dated: February 13, 2007

Bingham McCutchen LLP
3000 K Street, NW
Suite 300
Washington, DC 20007
(202) 373-6029